

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-9 and 11-19, were rejected. The claims were rejected under Section 102(e) over *Dabak*. Additionally, objection was made to informalities recited in claim 1. Objection was further made to the drawings for not showing a matched filter, recited in the claims.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed to distinguish better the invention of the present application over the reference cited against the claims. Claim 1 has been further amended in manners believed to correct the informalities to which objection was made by the Examiner.

Support for the amendments are found, for instance, on page 22, lines 1-5.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the recitation of the decoder has been amended, now to recite that the decoder directly combines received values of space-time encoded data in which the received values, once directly combined, form a real-valued vector, free of imaginary component parts. And, the recitation of the decoder has further been amended to recite that the decoder detects actual values of the symbols, based upon the real-valued vector. Method claim 11 has been analogously amended.

Dabak fails to disclose such structure, or corresponding method. While *Dabak* makes reference to space-time transmit diversity, there is no disclosure of decoding received signal information to form a real-valued vector, free of imaginary components. To the contrary, column 6, lines 10 – column 7, line 10 shows complex-valued parameters.

Remaining ones of the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over *Dabak* for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, independent claims 1 and 11, as now-amended, and the remaining ones of the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 09/848,794
Amendment dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8 June 05

Scheef & Stone, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com


Robert H. Kelly, Reg. No. 33922